

# The Converted Catholic

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

For the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and for the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION  
EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Director and Editor.

Trustees.

Bishop R. L. Rudolph, M.A., D.D. The Rev. D. J. Burrell, D.D., LL.D.  
Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D. The Rev. Henry Lewis, Ph.D.

The Rev. Albert B. King, D.D. (Honorary Vice-President).

331 West 57th Street,

NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXI.

OCTOBER, 1914.

No. 10.

## CONTENTS

	Page
"Jesus Only," "Absolutely Tender," "He and I".....	318
Editorial—The Sword .....	319
"    The Present War.....	320
"    Christ's Mission .....	321
"    A Request for Prayer .....	322
The Moody Bible Institute.....	322
Pius IX.....	323
A New Tone in Romanism.—From The United Presbyterian.....	329
Roman Quotations .....	329
Faith and Morals—Papal Domination. By Mr. Charles Eaton..	330
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, XXXI. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D. ....	337
Semper Eadem. By Musa Baker.....	342
The Coming Peace. By the Rev'd George M'Neely.....	344
A Jesuit as a Reporter. By W. H. Hanna.....	347
A Conversion to Protestantism. By J. S. Winner.....	350

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year.....	\$1.50	To Ministers and Missionaries.....	\$1.00
Single copy.....	15	Twenty or more copies, each....	10
Ten copies to one address, per year.....	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each .....	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Converted Catholic, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. No other acknowledgment will be made of payments in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is unnecessary, and is expensive, laborious and wasteful of much valuable time.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

## “JESUS ONLY”

2 Cor. 3: 18; Rom. 8: 32.

“Naught of self to mar His glory,  
Naught of sin to make it dim,  
Just a glorious, glorious shining  
That the friends around see Him,  
Resurrection joys abounding,  
Every morning, mercies new.  
Every day, His conscious Presence,  
All my life one interview.  
Soon He'll come, then I shall see Him,  
See my LORD, ‘The Crucified.’  
What a glorious day is breaking!  
He and I, quite satisfied.”

---

Absolutely tender!  
Absolutely true!  
Understanding all things,  
Understanding you!  
Infinitely loving—  
Exquisitely near—  
This is God our Father—  
What have we to fear?

F. M. N.

---

He and I, in that bright glory,  
One deep joy shall share—  
*Mine* to be forever with Him,  
*His* that I am there.—Gerhardt.

Box 1046, Los Angeles, Cal.

# The Converted Catholic

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXXI

OCTOBER, 1914

No. 10

## EDITORIAL NOTES

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword."—Matt. 10: 34.

The Roman Church interprets this saying of Jesus as a proclamation of the legitimacy of war. Cardinal Bourne cites it in "The London Standard," and many Catholic papers are making use of it to encourage and excite the people of the warring nations.

We believe that to use this text as a call to war, or to present it as a justification of war, is to abuse the Scriptures. Neither the spirit of Christ, nor the letter of the New Testament, warrants this crooked interpretation. The war upon earth, which our text undoubtedly refers to, is the result of the inward strife between the spirit and the flesh. No action or teaching of Jesus can be interpreted as meaning that it is ever lawful to take up the sword against any one, even if he be our enemy. Jesus established the Fatherhood of God, which makes all men brothers, without any national boundaries to separate us, or race characteristics to form barriers between us. The only sword He gave us was "the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," and the war that He declared was the war of Truth against error—of the regenerate soul against the works of the flesh. He is the Prince of Peace, but His peace is not like the peace of the world. Through His redemptive work we have peace with God and are enabled to sustain that warfare, as a result of which the flesh and its works are subjugated and brought under the complete dominion of the spirit. And the spirit, being "made more than conqueror, can henceforth control and use the natural man as a willing instrument. Paul well understood the meaning of this warfare, as do all those who have experienced the redeeming power of Christ. As soon as we try to make peace

with the flesh by compromise we lose the power, because the spirit loses his dominion. And as flesh and blood cannot understand the things which are of the Spirit, war, or discord, in society must follow. Looking back over the pages of Christian history, we see that from apostolic times to our own days this has been the case, often even between members of the same family.

How many, in following the voice of the Spirit, have been obliged to break the tenderest ties which bound them to parents, relatives and friends. I, myself, and many who have sought shelter in Christ's Mission—indeed, all those who have separated from Rome for conscience' sake—can speak from personal experience.

"I am come," says our Lord, "to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Loyalty to Christ requires us even to part from father and mother if they remain on the world's side, because "He that loveth father or mother *more than Me* is not worthy of Me."

The cause of such war is no other than the limitations of our frail nature, which makes us unable by ourselves to clearly *perceive* the things of God, and which lays us open to deception. So that, sometimes, we may even believe ourselves to be in the right when we are in the wrong. This was also foretold by Jesus when He said, "Yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." Witness the Inquisition and the religious persecutions of all times! What is the reason given by our Lord? "And these things will they do unto you, because *they have not known the Father, nor Me.*" (John 16: 2.)

*The Present War.* Our position with regard to the great European war now raging is absolutely neutral. We are in perfect accord with our President in this respect, and cannot too highly commend his attitude. Our hearts bleed for the sufferings brought about by the war, regardless of nationality. We deplore the war as a necessary evil, "for such things must needs be." (Mark 13: 7.) Consequently, in order to give no offence to our readers of various nationalities, who are loyal to their colors, we shall publish nothing that seems to place blame upon one side as against another.

We pray for peace, but we know that the day of peace can only come when "the kingdoms of this world shall have become the Kingdom of our God and of His Christ."

*Christ's Mission.* The services of Christ's Mission have been resumed since September 27th. We were glad to see so many of our friends at the service. We hope and pray that every one may lend a helping hand to make this new season the best we have had so far. We urge upon our friends everywhere to remember us very earnestly in their prayers. Times of tribulation are times of testing for God's people. The effects of the war are already felt on every hand and its consequences are dreaded. "Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth." (Luke 21: 26.)

Our Lord prophesied all these things, yet in the midst of His prophecy, as a student of His Word has pointed out, He gives us this word of encouragement, "It shall turn to you for a testimony." (Luke 21: 13.) The time of trial shall not only testify to us of God's love and protection, but it shall furnish an opportunity for testimony on our part. Let us not be slow to seize this great opportunity. Let us unite in more fervent prayer for those in bondage to Rome, and make a greater effort than ever before in their behalf.

The war has affected Christ's Mission seriously, the income of several friends and supporters having become so greatly reduced as to prevent them from doing for this work what they have done in the past. Our funds are very low in consequence, but we put the matter before our readers in the confidence that God is able to raise up other friends who will supply the deficiency. We trust that He will not allow the work to suffer.

*A Request for Prayer.* Not only is Christ's Mission suffering loss through the war, but all Christian missions feel the loss. And if missions in neutral countries suffer through loss of trade reducing the contributions of the benevolent, how much more keenly must the loss be felt by missions striving in the midst of the field of battle! We pray earnestly that God will have compassion on His servants everywhere and sustain them in the bitterness of their great trial. The following brief request for

prayer comes from France, addressed to the editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC: "110 rue de Noisy, Bagnolet, Seine, France, Oct. 8, 1914. My dear Brother: Our independent Christian work is tried during the war. Please, we ask your prayers. Yours fraternally, V. Hautefeuille, ex-priest." Censorship requires open letters, and our brother felt that he could write only this brief message on an open post-card. But between the lines it tells the story that touches our hearts. Brother Hautefeuille is the editor of "The Exodus," an evangelical French paper which comes to our office, but which we fear may have to be suspended during the war. We know our readers will not withhold their prayers in behalf of his work.

---

### THE MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE

The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago reports within the last few months an unusual interest among pastors in different parts of the country in a revival of real Bible study, and requests are multiplying for information and for conferences to arouse interest among the people in this important work, as a basis of conservative evangelism.

The Extension Department of the institute is temporarily short handed in its women workers by the departure of Miss Angy Manning Taylor for a six mouths' teaching tour in China and Korea, and the enforced departure of Miss E. Stafford Millar to her home in Australia to recuperate from a serious illness but its staff of men has been increased, and other women are to be added. It will arrange, as far as possible, to hold brief conferences in any important centre in the United States or Canada for the promotion of Bible study, and the deepening of the spiritual life, as well as conduct evangelistic meetings.

The teachers furnished for such conferences will include the special Bible teachers of the Extension Department, members of the Educational Faculty of the institute, and wherever desirable and possible, Bible teachers of prominence and ability, such as Dr. C. I. Scofield, Dr. L. W. Munhall, Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas and others. Pastors interested in such conferences are invited to correspond with the Extension Department of The Moody Bible Institute, 153-163 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill.

**PIUS X.**

One of the most pathetic figures of our time has passed away in the midst of a turmoil unexampled in the memory of man. Cardinal Sarto was welcomed as pope with an interest stimulated by curiosity. His election was an experiment. Not for untold years had such a pontiff been chosen. His peasant origin, his personal simplicity, his pastoral record, suggested an administration as foreign to the Vatican as his rustic speech and his familiar manners. The adulators who invariably surround a new pope prophesied great things: nor was he himself backward in promises. There is no reason to doubt his humility, and the call to such high place may have been as genuinely unwelcome as it was unexpected; but he accepted the position with cheery faith, and entered upon it with unbounded confidence. He had not chosen it; he had been chosen for it, and his piety would not allow him to have any doubts that copious ability would be extended to him by the grace of God. He announced the purpose of his pontificate, "to restore all things in Christ." The adulators took their cue, and explained that the worldly methods of diplomacy were to be abandoned in favor of evangelic directness. The pope was to be no more a politician; he was a *santo*, and would show the power of holiness. He has had his opportunity; he has passed away, and with what a record!

One of these dangerous friends put out a pamphlet some months after the election, entitled "*Pio X., suoi atti e suoi intendimenti.*" Here was sketched a vast scheme of reforms, which were shown to be adumbrated in the steps already taken by the new pontiff. There was scope for such activity. Abuses have always nestled in the Curia, and an institution so ancient is sure to be full of survivals which are useless and anomalous, even if they do not deserve the name of abuses. The abuses may be depended upon to fight hard for continuance, but the survivals are more subtly perilous. They tempt a reformer of a certain kind to utilize them, and in so doing to fall back upon machinery which has been allowed to rust as unsuited for present conditions. Pius X. was a reformer of this kind. It became evident that his conception of the papacy and of the Roman Church was based upon the text-books which he had studied

in his seminary, and not upon experience of men and institutions. There is much mediæval machinery in the Roman Church, which survives for the performance of formal offices, while more flexible instruments do the real administrative and disciplinary work. Pius X. labored to start the creaking wheels into active motion. An almost forgotten court like the *Rota* was set to work; the formalities of the *Cancellaria* and the *Dataria*, much simplified, indeed, but still redolent of obsolete practise, were revived as actual administrative processes. The mind of the pontiff stood revealed. He was no modern pope, like Leo XIII., or even Pius IX., content to go on developing the methods which the continuous experience of the Roman Church supplied; he would hark back; to restore all things in Christ was to revive the manners and methods of a particular period of Christian history. We are so familiar with this attitude of mind in the English Church that we can perhaps understand it better than any of those immediately under his control who were puzzled by the pope's conception of reform. Even his best endeavors were vitiated by this fault. We sympathize most entirely with his determination that little children shall be admitted to the Lord's table and that first communion shall not be put off to the age of twelve years or more; but this salutary reform was carried through with a hard abstract logic, a disregard for existing conditions, and a contempt for the advice of practical men, that made it, in the judgment of French bishops, at least, gravely injurious to the declining cause of religion.

In these last words we touch the leading characteristic of this pontificate. It would be in the highest degree unjust to hold Pius X. responsible for the strange decay of the Catholic Church—we speak not only of the Roman communion—which makes the present generation memorable; but his predecessor checked and delayed the falling-off by rendering Catholicism at least respectable. Some striking conversions in the last decade of the nineteenth century were due to the impression made upon an unbelieving world by the character, the wisdom and the moderation of Leo XIII. During the last ten years disaster has been almost unmitigated, and Pius X. has done nothing to check it, even if he has not done much to accelerate

it. He was deeply to be pitied. A storm was gathering which only the most skilful pilot could be expected to weather in safety; and he was without skill. He had no understanding of the storm; it merely bewildered him. Before he became pope he was probably unaware of its existence; at Rome he felt its full force. The problem of adjusting the presentment of the faith to modern minds has always been present with the Church; at times it becomes acute. It was at an acute stage nine years ago. Leo XIII. had been handling it wisely and prudently, even if without much personal comprehension. Pius X. plunged at it in terror. His characteristic defect was soon in evidence. His notion of restoring all things in Christ was to beat back new questions, and compel men to be satisfied with the same presentment of the faith which had sufficed for their grandfathers. It is not improbable that he himself invented the term "Modernist." At all events, he gave it all its vogue. But to use that word as a term of condemnation is merely to run away from pressing questions. Pius X. not only ran away himself — which might be wise — but insisted that every one else should run away as well. The strangely assorted opinions which the theologians who did his thinking for him gathered under the rubric of "Modernism" called for serious criticism; some of them demanded severe condemnation, all required checks, and none could look for any but the most guarded approval. All were lumped together for unqualified rejection. They were rejected, in the face of the world, not because they were demonstrably false or perilously doubtful, but because they were modern. The Church, and the faith which the Church holds, were made ridiculous. But for those who desired to remain in communion with the Church the farce became tragic. The most odious—because the least bloody—methods of the Inquisition were revived, and the worst kind of conformity has been made the law of Christian fellowship. The Anti-modernist Oath fails miserably of its object, but it must have inflicted a sore wound, perhaps a fatal wound, on many consciences.

The pope has found theologians, and skilful theologians, to do this work for him. There are sophistical theologians who can plead any cause, and there are dull theologians who are

probably not much more enlightened than the seminarist who became pope. But more sinister figures have gathered round Pius X., and he must be judged by his toleration or his employment of them. It is not merely that a simple-minded man fell into the toils of the astute. The sort of man from whom the simple-minded instinctively recoils was consistently favored by the late pontiff. No piety, no simplicity can cover up the conduct of the *Corrispondenza Romana*. It was base, and crudely base. The enemies and critics of the pope, who spared him no venom, had their attention directed by this means to his past record; it was strange if a man willingly employing such agents were all that he had been supposed to be. Merciless investigation soon dissolved the reputation which he had brought from Venice. It was found that as Bishop of Mantua he had been a far from satisfactory pastor; he had earned the dislike of his clergy by petty tyrannies and crooked methods of espionage. It was found that his success in the city of the Lagoons had been a success of intrigue. It is probable that grave injustice was done him by these delvings into the past; for not the least deplorable result of his policy has been to spread among his opponents the detestable methods that he encouraged or tolerated in his own agents. But enough was made good to show how small-minded a man had unhappily been raised to a responsibility so far beyond his capacity.

In higher quarters also Pius X. was badly served, and at the same time served as he would be served. He was to be no politician; he was to scorn the tricks of diplomacy. But the pope has a diplomatic service, admirably manned, and he cannot under existing conditions avoid diplomatic communications. He chose for his Secretary of State—and, as it turned out, for his evil genius—the young prelate, Merry del Val, who had been Secretary of the Conclave. In the annals of the Roman Court there have been some brilliant and some odious statesmen—a Consalvi, an Antonelli; there have also been some harmless men of affairs; but there has never been before such a blunderer as Cardinal Merry del Val. What theory of policy he formulated for himself and his master we will not try to guess; his practise has been simply to quarrel all around, if not on grave matters, then on trumpery points of etiquette. The recission of the Con-

cordat with France may be a good thing or a bad thing; but it was brought about by a glaring indiscretion of the Secretary of State concerning those courtesies of the heads of States which are the least valuable privilege of the Holy See. The refusal to fall in line with the *Loi de Séparation* may have been less unwise than we were at first disposed to think, but it was effected by a series of manœuvres calculated to produce the worst impression upon the French people and to provoke the bitterest resentment. It may have been necessary to make some explanations about the Borromeo Encyclical, but it was not necessary for the Secretary of State first to allow his master to do an unwise thing, and afterwards to make the most undignified withdrawal before the bullying of two Protestant Governments. In regard to the Italian kingdom, the papal policy of the last ten years has been feeble and confused. Leo XIII. was known to have established a *modus vivendi* by which friendly relations existed without any abandonment of theoretic claims on the part of the papacy. When the Patriarch of Venice was elected to succeed him there were hopes of further accommodation. The new pope was born an Austrian subject; when he was approaching middle life his allegiance was transferred by the fortunes of war to the Italian crown; not even Pius IX. would contest the right of Victor Emmanuel to Venetia, and Cardinal Sarto, as Patriarch of Venice, conspicuously acknowledged the sovereignty of successive kings of Italy. His detachment from the Roman question gave promise of at least some steps toward a settlement. But the management of this issue was in Cardinal Merry del Val's hands, and nothing has been done. The *modus vivendi* has been obscured; without acknowledging the right of the Italian Parliament to sit in Rome at all, the pope has meddled nervously and uncertainly with the elections; without openly acknowledging the authority of the king, he has encouraged recourse, when convenient to the king's courts of justice. Such conduct is worse than the intransigence of Pius IX.; it is incomparably worse than the cautious reticence of Leo XIII. The pope is detested as a meddler, who declines responsibility. He will neither acknowledge the king in Rome, nor defy him, nor let him alone. The position of the pope is worsened in the city. He may console himself under the insults of the Syndic by reflecting that

the municipality shows as little respect for the monuments' of pagan Rome as for the tradition of Christian Rome, but he may also reflect with some bitterness that Italy, either respectful or reconciled, would have made short work of the peculiarly Jewish vulgarity of Signor Nathan. To this the papacy has been brought in Rome; it is not feared, it is not loved, it is not even respected.

We turn to those acts of the pope for which his limitations have allowed more generous room. His reforms in the matter of Church music have been well devised, and in great measure successful. The result is perhaps the more remarkable in that he was himself an amateur of some credit. To the great work of the revision of the existing canon law, designed by his predecessor, he has added the impulse of his own impetuous determination. The reform of the lections of the Breviary, undertaken about the same time, seems to make slow progress, but the revolutionary alteration of the Psalter was carried through in headlong haste. If it is not canceled by his successor, so sharing the fate of previous recensions, it may furnish the most lasting monument of his pontificate. The invariable adulation that waits on papal acts has hitherto prevented any real criticism of the new arrangement; it is probable that complaints will now be heard, and that the tradition of centuries may still be found too firmly established to make way finally for the new order.

Two long pontificates, covering nearly sixty years, made the world forget how passing a phantom each pope has usually been. It is improbable that such abnormal experiences will be repeated. The death of Pius X. breaks the impression. He has had but a short time in which to dream of great things and to do his measure of harm. As a rule, the man chosen for pope is advanced in years—Leo XIII. was no exception—and occupies the Chair of St. Peter for but a brief period; he cannot impose his will or his judgment on the Roman Church; the institution is greater than the individual. A succession of brief pontificates will tend to diminish that exaggerated veneration for the actual pontiff which dates from the trials and the triumphs of Pius IX. A reforming pope will have the less scope, but a reactionary pope will be the more impossible. It has been the pathetic fate of Pius X. to succeed, as a most ordinary pontiff, two of the most extraordinary, and so to restore the normal conditions

of the papacy in a sense of which he did not dream. A pope of dreams must always be pathetic. There is so much apparent power for good, so little time in which to do anything but make disastrous mistakes.—From the *Church Times*.

---

### A New Tone in Romanism

It is unusual and agreeable to find in a Catholic journal any expression of sentiment looking in the direction of appreciation of Protestant church people, much less possible co-operation with them. Such sentiment has found a place in the columns of a journal named "The New World." It is quoted as advocating association between Protestant and Catholics in social service movements. In concluding an editorial which laments the "personal exclusiveness" of Catholics and their shortcoming in "wholesome, generous, human sociability," "It cannot but think how effectively Protestantism and Catholicism would balance each other. But if adjustment by union must be postponed, may not a counterpoise of knowledge be established? At least, with a passion of patience that will equal and make amends for our former passion of war, we may humbly set to work to learn for our own good one of the other." This is verily a new tone in a Catholic organ.—The *United Presbyterian*.

---

### Roman Quotations

"The Church never can come into its own, until there are more Catholics in Congress. The Church never will wield the influence for good which it should possess, until this comes to pass. Do not fear that there is any prejudice against Catholics in high places. There is none. You are not kept back, you are keeping yourselves back."—Archbishop Ireland.

"Education outside the Catholic Church is a damnable heresy."  
—Pope Pius IX.

"Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities, even to war and bloodshed."—The *Catholic World*.

"The public schools have produced nothing but a godless generation of thieves and blackguards."—Father Schaner.

**FAITH AND MORALS—PAPAL DOMINATION**

The pastoral letters of the Catholic Bishop of Newport, England, set forth the usurpations and meddlesomeness of the pope and his bishops in the affairs of men and States with less deception and equivocation than such and similar documents do from American bishops. Cardinal Gibbons is uncommunicative; he dodges. The pope's jurisdiction is "spiritual," he says. "Within its domain," he also says, "the civil government, in all matters that do not violate the moral law, is supreme; within its sphere the Church is supreme." With such and like cunning brevity he leaves us heretics to find out the items and details about hierarchical domination as good and bad luck may uncover to, or conceal from, our eyes. He is careful not to inform us that the papacy has invented "moral" laws and penalties not to be found in Jesus' teachings. These are the laws that fetter the mind and darken its vision, supply the spiteful, cruel hands of intolerance with stones, exact dumb submission instead of inculcating intelligent and prompt responsibility, nullify the sweet law of love and substitute iron-handed ecclesiastical autocracy for democracy and humaneness. He is mum about the fact that the rights of Americans touching the countless matters, both private and public, embraced in the papal phrase, "faith and morals," are to be determined and bounded, not by the people at their ballot-box, in their own country, but in the Vatican, in another country, by the pope and his prelates, who arrogantly deny their accountability to the American people; he is mum about the fact that he and his pope absolutely reject and condemn popular sovereignty—that jeweled crown of authority which Jesus gave the people, "the multitude," when He appealed to them to judge themselves what is right—that jeweled crown which our fathers handed down to all Americans—the right to choose "such principles" on which to frame laws "as seem to them," the American people—not popes and priests—"most likely to effect their safety and happiness." He is careful not to tell us plainly that he denies that our Constitution is, as it says, "the supreme law of the land." True it is that Gibbons praises our Constitution gushingly; albeit this laudation does not in the least hinder his enforcement of his Church decrees which

ostracize and boycott Catholics and thrust them into dishonored graves and into the endless anguish of hell for using and honoring the rights the sacred writing guarantees. It should not be overlooked, however, that the cardinal speaks in widely different documents—one kind being in English and phrased with diplomatic skill for Protestant and lay Catholic eyes, the other being in Latin, in the form of decrees—“Acts and Decrees of the Baltimore Council”—for the eyes of priests and bishops. A study of his Latin documents will show that they are in accord with the grasping, despotic spirit of the English bishop's official letters, which follow:

“The Church,” the Newport bishop says, “has not only a sphere of her own, in which she is directly and immediately supreme, but by virtue of her office she can and must intervene in everything in which men and women are concerned as moral beings with a rational destiny and free will—in family life, in commerce, in society, in the work of the State and in general politics. This conception of the Church, it need not be said, is directly contrary to what are called modern ideas. Nevertheless, Catholics have always held it and could not cease to hold it without ceasing to be Catholics. . . . She [the Church] has never accepted from men either a definition of her office or any limitation of her prerogative. . . . She has the inherent right to define her own work, to choose her own means and instruments and to set down the limits of her own authority. Thus she is a true and genuine kingdom. [Not a “democracy,” as President Wilson has tried to persuade us to believe.] It is a kingdom which is at once spiritual and temporal—spiritual in its ends and its endowments, temporal in its recognizable position among all other empires, States and Governments of this world, as their *mistress*, their guide and sometimes their *rival* and their destruction. . . . Catholics are bound to accept her [the Church's] official teachings and ordinances on every point on which her accredited organs shall pronounce. . . . You will say that priests, bishops and even popes (outside of their *ex-cathedra* pronouncements) may make mistakes. They may conceivably. But for all that you are bound to accept what they say, not only with outward respect, but (unless you really know better) with

interior assent. . . . At the time that the pontifical declaration is made no man can know any better. Those who say they know better are *not to be believed*. . . . It is this continual action of the Catholic Church in the guidance of mankind that the world resents as interference and the true Catholic calls light and help. . . . Not only has no State or Legislature any title to quash or abrogate her laws, but no human kingdom or republic can be as God and right reason would desire it to be, unless it makes her laws its guiding principles and refuses to sanction what she condemns. And for the better fulfilment of this her office she justly claims . . . the right to hold property and the prerogative of enforcing her commands even with coercive penalties. . . . Every law and ordinance of the Church must be accepted and obeyed, even at the risk of loss, disability and penalty. . . . A Catholic in the times in which we live is bound to do his best to prevent bad law and to secure for the Church her full rights. It is his duty to influence, as far as he can, both the Legislature and the executive administration of his country. [Such are the duties of President Wilson's Catholic secretary.] This, under present circumstances, is chiefly done by the vote. . . . It is also done—and sometimes in a far more effective way—by steady and quiet work on committees and boards, and by the exhibition of a conciliatory spirit which disarms adversaries who would yield nothing to fierce denunciation and to the crude temper of the mere partisan. . . . Let it be carefully noted that the use of the vote, . . . in defense and support of the Church, is obligatory on Catholics."

Thus far I have quoted from the 1909 advent pastoral of this English bishop.

Manifestly a Catholic in public office is obliged, first, last and all the time, to obey his bishop and the pope whenever they say their "interests" and "rights" are liable to be affected; that at such times he must ignore the desire and the demands of the people who elevated him to office, if these desires and demands conflict with the schemes and ambition of his ecclesiastical superiors; that at such times he must serve the Church—the pope and his priests—and not the people, not his country.

The following is from the same bishop's Lenten letter of 1913:

"She [the Church] has a right . . . to decree and carry out the . . . administrative arrangements that she considers necessary. . . . No earthly power can legitimately interfere with her in these rights and she has no responsibility in their exercise to any prince or republic, any tribunal or parliament. . . . Catholics are, under the most serious obligation, to think, speak and act with the Church whenever she asserts her freedom and whenever her pastorate prescribes definite practical means to secure it."

These two letters are not mere speculations or opinions. They are official instructions and obligations from a prelate, oath-bound to voice the laws of his Church; they were written with technical conformity to pontifical decrees and canons "binding Catholics under our dear banner as well as those under the British flag.

What Protestant voter could claim to be an American free-man, without blushing with shame in making the claim if he were under such absolute subjection to his pastor, as is here coolly dictated to Catholics? Of what benefit to a citizen or to his State is the ballot if the pope and his priests bind him with such shackles and chains and control his use of the ballot?

A Catholic "is bound to do his best to . . . secure for the Church her full rights." "Full rights" mean the right of the pope and his priests to reign and rule supreme in all matters touching faith and morals; and their right to boycott and persecute and damn Americans to hell who challenge their invasions and usurpations; and these words also mean their right to demand the money of the people—take their money from them individually or from their public tax-moneys—all under the menace of hell. (Catechism of Baltimore Council, Gibbons' commendation, lesson 29, question 1; lesson 35, question 1, commandment 5.) A supreme and most sacred right of man—and of States—is to judge what is right and wrong. The action and function of man's mind are not complete if forbidden to so judge or if abridged therein. An American stripped and robbed of authority over faith and morals is a fraction of and not an integral man; he is disabled and disqualified for self-govern-

ment; he is incapacitated to perform the duties of a citizen in our Republican government; for how can he select the principles on which to construct society and frame laws—as our Declaration of Independence says—if the pope despoils him of authority to judge which principle is good and which is bad? Think of the people of New York or New Hampshire being obliged to ask the pope or Cardinal Farley or Cardinal O'Connell for leave to prohibit slavery, or polygamy, or the saloon; whether they may have schools under their control and make marriage laws; whether they may arrest and punish priests for crimes and sue them for debts, and tax church property; whether they may teach eugenics and the formation of character in the public schools; whether they may have free speech and a free press and free worship; whether they may demand interest on loans, and whether they may give women the ballot! The very thought of such subjection shocks enlightened intelligence. But the pope claims these matters to be within the realm of faith and morals and hence within his jurisdiction; and Gibbons and the other hierarchs who controlled the utterances of the Catholic congress in Baltimore in 1889 had it declare that no Government has the right to "affect the interests" of the pope "by any form of legislation or other public act to which his approbation has not been previously given."

Here is the decree of papal despotism over the mind, the heart, the tongue, the hands and the purse of man:

"We teach and declare that . . . the power of jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff . . . is immediate"—snug around the neck!—"to which all . . . both pastors and faithful . . . are bound . . . by true obedience to submit . . . in matters which belong to faith and morals. . . . This is the teaching of Catholic truth from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation."

This decree covers all our States, all our cities, towns and homes; it covers the bond of marriage; it embraces books, papers, libraries, schools, colleges and universities; it is the censor of theatres, platforms, conventions, Legislatures and courts; it rules social organizations and dictates charities; it dictates at the fireside, peers into the bridal chamber and meddles

with the cradle; it includes our Bible, our songs and music, and inscribes "pest-house" on non-Catholic churches; moreover, this decree writes the candidate's name, or the yea or nay, on the voter's ballot. You will also notice how it opens the smoking portals of the pope's hell to terrorize us into submission. Cardinal Gibbons, whom the politicians glorify, was a member of the council in Rome that formulated the infamous document.

If Austria deserves the execration of civilization for fighting Servia and entangling Europe in war because Servia excluded Austrian agents from her courts wherein some conspirators were to be tried, what does the Roman pontiff deserve for usurping jurisdiction over all the innumerable matters, all the sacred rights of man, in the sphere of faith and morals under the American flag and under the flags of all the world? The outrage of the British Parliament in taxing our patriot-fathers does not compare with this insufferable papal invasion and usurpation.

Excellent Protestants there are who frown upon us who resist papal domination as bigots, vilifiers, nobodies. When papal precepts incited Catholics in Denver to maul the life nearly out of a Baptist minister and leave him to die by a lonely wayside in the night, "The Congregationalist"—reputedly a good Samaritan—dubbed the helpless victim "a nobody" and left him—left him as his kidnappers had, alone to his fate, in the darkness. Such is the sense of justice and patriotism in a "choice" number of Protestants who can see papal priests goad their adherents to revolt against our school laws; see these priests force Catholics to shun the society and religious worship of their Protestant neighbors as poison; see these priests teach the laymen to destroy the Protestant Bible, mob ex-priests and ex-nuns, boycott non-Catholic storekeepers, publishers, employees and professional men; see the bishops manipulate the Catholic vote for this or the other candidate, according as the candidate "deserves well in the Catholic cause"—as required by the pope; and see these bishops and priests rouse their followers to injure, as far as they can, by the boycott, the approaching world-wide celebration, in San Francisco; because a thoroughly upright and able man was commissioned by the Italian king to care for his country's interests at the celebration, and who had voiced the gratitude and happiness of the people of Rome—of which city he was mayor—

in a speech at their commemoration of breaking the yoke of papal misgovernment—these Protestants can see these things without saying a word against the imposture, the lies, the shocking terrorism and proscription by which these wicked deeds are instigated. These Protestants also can see Catholic wives or husbands estranged and separated or sent to hell and their offspring branded with bastardy—all done by the hierarchy—because they were united in marriage by some one not a priest; these Protestants can see fathers and mothers disgraced and dumped into hell by model bishops for sending children to our schools; these Protestants can see these same “good” bishops smite noble Catholic citizens with defamation and cast them into perdition for fellowshipping with our benevolent organizations, or for publicly rebuking sacerdotal corruption and imposture; these Protestants can witness this religious tyranny and fanatical brutality without seeing that religious liberty and freedom of speech and freedom of the press are thereby being extirpated; and that areas in our cities and towns are fast increasing in extent and number where the disloyal priests are establishing a mental, social and political life that, year by year, resembles more and more existence in Spain, Lower Canada, the south of Ireland and Peru.

Who are the true Americans and the true friends of the Catholic laymen, the robed clericals who, as the pope's satraps, would rule the people by Vatican laws? Who are the false Americans and the false friends of the Catholic laymen, the anti-clericals who would let the people rule themselves? Did the good and great Lincoln plead from the sacred graves on the field of Gettysburg's awful battle for a government by the papal hierarchy?

Reinforced by the flames of the pope's hell, the stinging serpents and social cruelties of persecution that partly constitute “coercive penalties” and the obligation to use the “vote” in support of the pope and his priests will soon make the pope's “kingdom” the “mistress,” the “rival” and the “destruction” of our free States if the self-seeking politicians and the unconcerned Washington Gladdens have their way.

Read the above pastorals and the Vatican decree of universal despotism once more and ask others to read them.

Waterloo, N. H.

CHARLES EATON.

**LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS**

XXXI.

Dear Cardinal:

My last letter to you, which appeared in the September number, was written some time in July from Porto Rico. Since then, the European war has broken out, Pope Pius X. has died and Cardinal de La Chiesa has been elected pope. In all these events we have noticed such peculiarities as to make us wonder whether they are not surrounded by the mysteries characteristic of your Church's policy.

As you have affirmed that your Church has no secrets, and also that it is not a political machine, here is a great opportunity for you to explain certain anomalies which are quite inexplicable to ordinary observers, that is, to those uninitiated in the secrets of the Vatican, which *undoubtedly do exist*, notwithstanding your denial.

In the circumstances attending the death of Pius X. there was noticeable a great contradiction between the teachings and practise of your Church. It is taught that the pope has direct communication with God. Pius died like any other mortal, without any previous revelation of the day or the hour of his departure. He was noted for his zeal in emphasizing the power of indulgences and the miraculous virtue of relics and images. Lourdes and many other shrines were enriched with his special blessings, and he encouraged pilgrimages for the restoration of health. According to the "Catholic Standard," of Philadelphia, he canonized six saints and "beatified" sixty-three, declaring them to be miracle-workers, and yet, when he was himself sick, instead of making use of the miraculous water of Lourdes, or the wonder-working bones of saints, of which, besides all manner of relics, the Vatican is a well-supplied store-house, he called in his physicians and placed himself entirely at their mercy, thus not only failing to practise, but tacitly denying the faith in saints and miracles which he had taken so much pains to foster among his people.

In the same Catholic paper it is affirmed that the pope himself performed a great many miracles, and the case of a schis-

matic bishop is related, who, being paralytic, asked the pope to bless him and instantly received the use of his limbs. In the issue for September 12th we read: "The late pontiff is described on all hands, even by non-Catholic critics, as a saintly man. Hints have already been made at early canonization. Although remarks such as these are obviously premature, there can be no doubt about the extraordinary personal sanctity of Pius X. Tales have been told for many a year of remarkable graces received through him, of wonders worked by his prayers. He has often been called a miracle-worker. In each case in which some noteworthy result has followed his supplication to the Almighty, he has told the grateful recipient of pontifical favor to go and tell no man. This writer has at various times been told under promise of secrecy of specific, authenticated instances of the granting of favors, in several cases physical cures, on the intervention of the late pope. These stories were told by personal friends of his holiness."

Similar stories have been told of the last three popes, Leo XIII. excepted. I well remember when there was a great movement to promote the canonization of Pius IX. Many miracles were ascribed to him, but when the private life of Cardinal Antonelli, his secretary of state, and also the rascality of his *own adopted son* unexpectedly became public, the case was dismissed.

Why is it, Cardinal, that the Church has to have recourse to such lies for her glory? Did you ever stop to think of it? And why do not you, as a prince of the Church, come out boldly and say, "That is a lie. No one has ever heard before that Pius X. was a worker of miracles." If you were capable of such boldness, we should be more inclined to believe in you. But while you are shielding the faults of the Church, while you are fostering her false teachings for the sake of her glory and allowing such things to go on as the veneration of the bones of Saint Ann for the sake of the income of half a million dollars that it brings in every year from the ignorant, you must expect your word to be doubted.

Another anomaly to which attention has already been called in this magazine, is that the pope, gifted with such sanctity and

power, is said to be so deep in purgatory that all the faithful are commanded to pray for the repose of his soul, and masses are said for him in all Catholic churches.

Now, Cardinal, is your chance to explain this riddle. The Church teaches that the pope, a vicegerent of God, has supreme power in Heaven and upon earth. With the power of the keys he can shut or open the gates of Heaven at will. Few popes have exercised this power to a greater degree than Pius X. He even extended the plenary indulgence of the Porciuncula to secular churches, a thing which no former pope could be persuaded to do. Other graces were conferred by him upon "fake" relics, hitherto unheard of.

This generosity in using the power of the keys for opening the gates of Heaven was probably what inspired Secretary Bryan in the composition of the message of condolence he sent to the Vatican. We know that Mr. Bryan has confessed to having a "*warm spot*" in his heart for Rome.

Let us recall the exact wording of the message:

"The President desires me to express his sense of the great loss which the Christian world has sustained in the death of his holiness, Pius X. By his pure and *gentle character*, his unaffected piety and his broad and thoughtful sympathy with his fellow men, he adorned his exalted station and attracted to himself the *affectionate regard* of all who felt his world-wide influence."

I think, as you undoubtedly do also, that the *warm spot* of Secretary Bryan made him go too far. Secretary Bryan, at any rate, must feel some self-satisfaction at the thought that his message of condolence was the *longest* one received at the Vatican.

I do not think that France, Portugal, Italy, Spain, or some other nations, would agree with him as to the *gentle character* of Pius X.—as a pope, at least—nor as to "the *affectionate regard* of *all* those who felt his world-wide influence." For Mr. Bryan does not know that, although Pius X. was so generous on the one hand in opening Heaven's gates, on the other he exercised his supposed power to close them more than any other pope of modern times. Not being able to make use of the Inquisition, he has done this by means of excommunication, and his excom-

munications have frequently been fulminated against men far above him in scientific knowledge and true worth.

But this pope, who has exercised such spiritual power and into whose coffers have poured millions of dollars from individuals as well as families, in payment for the privilege of release from purgatory, or for the *buletto* of his blessing at the hour of death —this pope himself, at his death, strange and contradictory as it may seem, is said to need the united efforts of all his people to get him out of this very purgatory!

Two questions which always used to perplex me greatly were these: How is it possible for a pope to go to purgatory? And how, if the power of the mass is infinite, can purgatory exist at all? I remember I went once to consult my professor of theology concerning the doubts which were so greatly troubling me. He told me that a pope's responsibility was so great that, however saintly he might be, he was undoubtedly obliged to go to purgatory for a season. "But," he added, to reassure me, "he would not stay there long, for the next pope would get him out." This answer, instead of satisfying me, gave rise to many more doubts. It seemed to me to be too inconsistent with the teachings of the Church respecting the power and infallibility of the pope. Once I went to Father V. de T., an old man, and told him what my professor had said. "Oh," explained he, "if such is the case, I do not expect to see many popes in Heaven!" "Why?" said I. "Because," he answered, "I do not believe that any pope would open the door of Heaven to his predecessor."

Here is another question: Did you ever stop to think, Cardinal, that if your theology be true, poor Pius X. cannot be in purgatory? If your theology be true, Pius X. has never really been pope. Let us see how this may be logically deduced from the teachings of your Church.

Your theology teaches that the election of a pope is fully controlled by the Holy Ghost, and that, precisely for that reason alone, the pope becomes the successor of St. Peter and the vicar of Christ. To the end that the Holy Spirit may not be hindered, the strictest precautions are taken. Walls are put up around the place of the conclave and cells, as sumptuous as palaces, are built for the cardinals within the Vatican, at a cost of thousands of

dollars, to prevent outside influences from penetrating. Excommunications are read against those cardinals who should dare to allow any worldly influence to move them in the election of the new pope. Mass is said addressed to the Holy Ghost, and all the liturgy is directed toward the object of securing His presence in the conclave. Stories are also read relating instances of bad cardinals having written one name and the Holy Ghost having changed it to another, etc., etc.

Now, all the world knows that if the Holy Ghost was in reality present in the Vatican at the last conclave, He elected Cardinal Rampolla. All your Catholic papers, even up to the present date, affirm that Rampolla would have been pope instead of Sarto, had it not been for the veto of Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria. One of your favorite papers says: "The emperor, by his veto, succeeded only in delaying the policy of Leo XIII. for some years; his victory was only apparent."

Now, here is the great dilemma. Who was inspired by the Holy Ghost, the cardinals at the conclave, or Francis Joseph, emperor of Austria? If it was the cardinals, Rampolla was the true successor of Peter; if it was the emperor, then all must agree that there is a power on earth higher than that of the pope—a proposition already condemned by several popes as heresy.

A way out of the difficulty is not to be found by saying that the cardinals agreed upon Sarto for the sake of avoiding trouble with the emperor. They will have to renounce their claim to inspiration by the Holy Spirit. If they do not renounce this claim, they must confess that by electing Sarto they have sinned against the Holy Ghost. Sarto, in such case, had no right to pose as the successor of Peter and vicar of Christ.

Cardinal Sarto, then, not being a true pope, must be considered an usurper, and, for a man who occupied his position for eleven years and laid claim to such spiritual dominion, you must agree with me, Cardinal, that purgatory, according to your own theology, not mine, is too good a place.

Far be it from us to judge Sarto, the man, but there are many reasons to make us believe that Pius X., as pope, throughout his pontificate was destitute of the gifts of the Holy Spirit claimed for him by the Church.

As a human soul, responsible to his Maker, let us leave Pius X. to God's infinite compassion and tender mercy. But, as a pope, he is responsible to mankind as well, and we are bound to study the events of his pontificate and point out once again the falsity and error of the papal claims.

This we shall attempt to do in our next letter.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

### SEMPER EADEM

The following extract from a letter written by a Canadian Baptist missionary in La Paz, Bolivia, will indicate the character of and the fruits of the system of Roman Catholicism whenever and whenever it has free sway, unopposed by a virile Christian testimony.

In these days there are so many who are ready to cry out, "Bigot! bigot!" when the truth is made known that it may be wise to view the picture presented in the following excerpt of conditions as they exist when and where priestcraft rules absolutely. This is not a time to "Cry, Peace, peace, where there is no peace!" The Roman hierarchy and true Christianity are as opposite as the poles in all that goes to make up true morality, liberty or godliness.

E. BOSWORTH,

Secretary Grande-Ligne Mission, Montreal, Canada.

The missionary thus writes:

"I feel that it is necessary to sound a note of warning to all the good people at home against the quiet and insidious workings of the Roman Catholic Church. They have been driven from, or have entirely lost their power in all their old strongholds, and to fight their last battle they have concentrated all their forces in Protestant lands. They have sworn to make America Catholic, and slowly but surely they are gaining power. If you could live in some of these South American republics and see with your own eyes the degradation for which only the Church is to blame, surely it would cause you to bestir yourselves and see to it that Rome never reaches the place where she can cast her blighting and degrading influences over our fair land. It is so hard to convince our liberal Anglo-Saxons that

Rome is first and foremost a political organization. Her claim of being a Christian Church is only her cloak of disguise. She has been in South America for four centuries, with the result that we know only too well. . . .

"Rome has been proven and found wanting in many lands. I pray you get acquainted with her and know her as she is, and not as she would like to have you believe her. She wears quite a clean cloak in Protestant lands, because she must, but underneath is the poison of the serpent which will blight our fair land and make slaves of our children if she once gets the upper hand. Surely if she had done her duty and been an influence for real good, Bolivia would not look upon her to-day as an enemy. They know where to lay the blame for their country's backwardness. More and more the country favors the work of the Protestant missionaries, so I say to you, 'Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.' Our forefathers suffered from this yoke of bondage. I pray you open your eyes to the real danger that threatens and see to it that the Roman Catholics are given less power in the affairs of the nation.

"This letter may not be along the lines you want, but I feel that it is time a real fight was begun against an organization which menaces our freedom, and if by this warning I can arouse some of you to action, I feel that it will have accomplished great good.

"We are slowly plodding along, and we can but sow the seed, leaving the results with God, who only can see the end. It will of necessity take years to put life into a nation which has been killed by the blighting influences of the Roman system. I have no doubt about the final outcome. The truth must prevail, and victory will be for the side of truth; still I think we may have to gain it through much suffering and possibly bloodshed.

"The present system of separate schools is one of the greatest evils of our day. You will do well to oppose it with all your might.

"Praying that all may be aroused to a sense of personal obligation in this matter, and that God's cause may triumph, I am,

"Very sincerely yours,

"La Paz, Bolivia.

MUSA BAKER."

## THE COMING PEACE

BY THE REV. GEORGE M'NEELY.

NOTE.—The following article was offered to the "Newark News" (N. J.) in reply to its editorial on "The Failure of Christ's Peace," but was not accepted. Small-minded newspapers do not like to publish refutations of their views.

"And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet." With these and other like warnings Jesus Christ spoke to His disciples concerning the end of this age. More than 500 years before the time of Christ, Isaiah had foretold a blessed age of peace and the disciples were anxiously inquiring when it should come. Jesus forewarns them of a period of tribulations which should first come and be the prelude to the age Isaiah mentions in the following prophecy:

"1. The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.

"2. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

"3. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"4. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people, and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Note that the time of peace is inseparably connected with the establishment of the Lord's house; that the Lord's house is the house of the God of Jacob; that the whole prophecy concerns Judah and Jerusalem; for out of Jerusalem shall go the word of the "Lord of all the earth." Therefore, until Jerusalem is the ruling city on the earth, the earth may not know peace, even as Isaiah also says in his prophecy:

"1. For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness: and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth.

"2. And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new-name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name.

"3. Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God.

"6. I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night: ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence.

"7. And give him no rest, till he establish, and till he make Jerusalem a praise in the earth."

God hath ordained that the world shall be brought under one Government, and that Government the Government of Christ Jesus. The present state of affairs of many Governments on the earth, each competing with the other, is an ungodly and unnatural condition, characteristic of but one epoch in the history of the world.

The first Government, that of Babel, was a world Government and the cradle of civilization. We find its history in the Bible, and have this history confirmed by recent discoveries. The whole earth was of one language and one speech. God designed men to go to their appointed places—north, south, east and west, filling the earth with the glory of God. They rebelled against God's will, and on coming to the land of Shinar set themselves to build a city and a tower, lest they should be scattered abroad on the earth. Contrary to their expectations God scatters them abroad by confounding their language. The seat of world government is next found in Egypt. By reason of the famine mentioned in Genesis 42 all lands came to Egypt buying corn, and Egypt gained authority over them. The government of the Pharaohs being sunken into an administration of the worship of birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things, God called Israel from its bondage in order to keep the covenant made before with Abraham, that he would be a great nation in whom all the earth should be blessed. Accordingly, in due process of time, we have all the nations of the earth coming to the "glory of Solomon" and owning him as king of kings. Not long did the supremacy of Israel continue, but because they rebelled against Jehovah and failed to glorify Him as the source of their power, God gave them up to correction, until David's son and lord, the God-man, should come to sit upon "The throne of David and upon his kingdom; to order it and to establish it with judgment, and with justice from henceforth even forever." At Israel's rebellion God transferred the Government from Jerusalem to Babylon; and Nebuchadnezzar became the ruler of the world. Babylon was succeeded by the Medo-Persian monarchy, which, in turn, gave way before Alexander, who made Greece the centre of world power, and when the enfeebled power of Greece might

no longer retain the sceptre of imperialism Rome grasped it; and in the days when there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed He was born whom Moses and all the prophets had foretold—the Wonderful, Councillor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, He who was to bring peace as a mighty river, which, beginning at Jerusalem, was to extend to all the earth. "He came unto His own (the Jews) and His own received Him not," but took council how they might destroy Him. As a result of this rejection of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ He plainly told His disciples that the effect of His coming would not be peace but war—"Think not that I bring peace, but a sword"—that the order of events would be sufferings first and glory following; that He was to suffer many things and be crucified and rise again the third day and ascend up on high, "Far above all principalities and powers," and come again in majesty to rule the earth.

"3. And as he sat upon the mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?

"4. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you.

"5. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.

"6. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.

"7. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places.

"8. All these are the beginning of sorrows.

"29. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:

"30. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

Jesus, not only to His disciples, but also before the rulers, claimed kingship. The accusation brought against him before Pontius Pilate was, "This Fellow perverteth the nation, saying He Himself is Christ, a King." To Pilate Christ repeated his claim. And Pilate, convinced of Christ's title, brought Him out before the assembled Jews, saying unto them, "Behold your King." They cried crucify Him, we have no king but Cæsar." Rejected and crucified, Christ came forth from death the third

day, and after showing Himself to His disciples and speaking to them for the space of forty days concerning the Kingdom He went "on high" to receive the Kingdom title and to return. During His absence the apostles announce Him as the "Coming King." Peter speaks of Him as ready to return and restore all things. Paul proclaims Him in the city of Thessalonica, and the rulers of the city accuse those who follow Paul with this indictment: "These have come hither who have turned the world upside down, saying, 'There is another King than Cæsar, one Jesus.'" The power behind the Roman throne and behind all earthly Governments was the devil, who had offered Jesus the kingdoms of the world, with the explanation that they were delivered unto him, and he, the devil, gave them unto whomsoever he would. In the efforts of the devil to retain supremacy over the kingdoms a mighty drama is developing its plot upon the earth. The debased will of fallen humanity, stirred up by "The ruler of the darkness of this world" is everywhere and always in rebellion against God; and according to Scripture this plot shall proceed in its unfolding by famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, wars and rumors of wars, until finally the devil, at the head of apostate Christendom, and Christ, at the head of restored Israel, shall confront one another on the stage of the earth, set for the real Armageddon. Then when the wicked one shall be revealed the Lord shall destroy him, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; then, and not till then, shall they beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

---

## A JESUIT AS A REPORTER

(For the CONVERTED CATHOLIC.)

Not long since some unknown friend sent us a copy of a Romanist weekly published in Cincinnati, in which John Tompkins, S. J., purported to give an insight into Protestant missionary work in Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines.

It seems wise to give heed to some of the things written lest lies become the foundation of faith. The priest enlarged

upon the fewness of the worshipers that may be seen on the Lord's Days in Methodist and Christian churches and the few students that are to be found in Protestant dormitories. Of course, he did not state the fact that in the Protestant churches there is to be found a larger percentage of the members present to worship than in his own Romanist temple. The number of students is not small, for last year it was thirty and more in each Protestant dormitory, and that number is about eight or ten times more than ought to be expected considering the numerical strength of Protestants.

Again, the son of Loyola sought to justify the medieval barbarism of burning Gospels and Acts in the presence of hundreds of howling children who are becoming hoodlums under the tutelage of Mr. Tompkins. They are instructed not to listen to a Protestant preacher, but to try to howl him down; to lie about being able to read if they are offered literature, or to tear it up after they do receive it. He gleefully relates how a high-school girl deceived a missionary into giving her two Bibles (the missionary says it was only one) by stating that she had become greatly interested in the Book and then had turned the Books over so that they might be burned.

The faith of the writer in the Old Testament as the Word of God was also traduced, for the Jesuit reported that a missionary had told a student with whom he was debating that the Old Testament is not a part of the Word of God. The fact is that the student wanted to know why the books of Maccabees are not to be found in the Protestant Bible, and he was told that they are not part of the true Word of God. Just who lied to the glory of the pope cannot be said.

Again his irreverence tells that Protestants preach in the public square on Romanist feast days, and that he has seen from his window in the convent a Protestant preaching on Good Friday and not a soul was listening to him. What idiots we are! I can testify that whenever one missionary preached on the plaza there were hundreds who listened to him. He complains that we disturb the simple-minded worshipers. They are not troubled. They enjoy the meat of

God's Word which they receive from us after the empty sounds and chaff they were regaled with in the church. The spirit of the Jesuit is galled because he has been unable to stop our public preaching, so he deems it seemly to bear false witness. If it is troubling about which he complains, we can also retaliate. We must suffer the noise and confusion of his processions which pass our houses. Our souls are vexed with the idolatrous sights. We must wait patiently at some cross street for many minutes until the petticoated priests have piloted their pedestaled pomp beyond the intersection. We know and instil the principles of religious toleration and so suffer in silence; the Jesuits do otherwise.

In his last paragraph, Mr. Tompkins shows his great love for Protestants and, incidentally, his true reason for reporting. If people in the United States only knew the beautiful, earnest Christian life of the Filipinos they would cease to give their money so that troublers of the papal Israel may be supported here. What Christian concern for the money of Protestants who are all hell-bound! What fatherly interest in the Filipinos who may be seriously injured by reading the sacred Scriptures in their own tongue! Amiable ambition that the perfect shall not be polluted by the Protestants!

The Filipinos are in need of a personal acquaintance with the living Christ, for they know only the Babe of Mary and the dead Christ on the cross. They need to be freed from the sins of lying, gambling, drunkenness, avarice, fornication and adultery. The course of the priests aids in the retention of these sins. The Filipinos need to be rescued from the superstition and falsehood of the Roman Catholic Church. Yea, because the Jesuits are here in goodly numbers, the natives need to be saved from the duplicity and fanaticism of the Jesuits. Protestants are at work on this gigantic task. They cannot be barred now as they were in the days of Spanish domination. Jesuits will not poison and cause to be slaughtered now as they have done, or have not yet chosen to begin such sacred labors, but they know that if missionary givers can be gulled into believing their lying reports, the support of missionaries will be cut off and the desire of the Romanist heart realized. "The end justifies the means." Under the black robe of the

Jesuit the devil has his habitation. In the lines that a Jesuit writes expect to find lies cunningly interwoven. The testimony of native Filipinos as to moral conditions in the Philippines can be found in Senate Document No. 190. The report of the Taft Commission to the Philippines makes clear that it must be a part of the Christian program to give the open Bible and a fair chance to develop holiness to the eight millions who dwell in the Philippine Islands.

Why does the Jesuit rage and imagine vain things in his heart? He is so much a friend of the Church which he believes to be holy, catholic and apostolic and which the world knows is Roman that he is an enemy of the spiritual welfare of men. Better, thinks he, the worst conceivable character who has been Roman Catholicized than the best type of man who submits to Christ but rejects the pope. "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." W. H. Hanna,

Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines. Missionary, F. C. M. S.

---

### A CONVERSION TO PROTESTANTISM

I desire, for the benefit of others, briefly to give a short account of my recent conversion to Protestantism after having been a member of the Roman Catholic Church for over fifty-one years. I was so saturated with Romish doctrines during that entire period that it was utterly impossible for me to even hint at any other belief being a possibility, until I fortunately became engaged to marry an estimable woman, a stanch Protestant and a Baptist. After our engagement, religious matters naturally loomed up much to my trepidation, because now I began to experience the feeling of being subjected to the supreme test of my life—the experience of having my religious belief questioned by the very one in whom I was so deeply interested. I had never read a line of the Bible in my life; in fact, that sacred Book is tabooed by all good Catholics, who must take their religion from the "fathers," the pope and the priests, as well as tradition.

When my dear friend, now dead, and I conversed about who should marry us, the trouble began. I desired to be joined in wedlock by a Romanist priest, and she, naturally enough, wanted a Protestant minister to perform the ceremony. She would never

permit a priest to marry her, and furthermore, she had made a vow never to marry a Catholic. I would not give the girl up, and consented to her proposition to study the Bible with her in order to see whether or not the Romish faith is the true one. During these happy months my intended wife was called home to Jesus, and I can never forget the scene at her death-bed, so happy and content was she as she passed to the great beyond. Our few weeks of study, however, opened wide my eyes to the errors of Romanism and made a lasting impression. Through a correspondence with Miss Nicolet, a Baptist missionary, engaged in work among French Catholics and others of that faith, I finally concluded to renounce Romanism and become associated with Protestantism, and am now, I thank God, a member of the Baptist religion. My parents are Catholic, and so are the rest of my family connections, one a nun, and I had three uncles, now dead, who were Romish priests. I was educated in a Catholic college, and always believed that religion to be the only true faith to believe in, and that all outside its pale were condemned to everlasting punishment. Miss Nicolet very kindly took a great interest in my study of the Protestant religion, and also enlightened me as to the true nature of Catholic religion, a thing that never entered my head before, because I was always taught to never question the truth of an article of faith of the Catholic religion. She recommended to me for reading such great works as Father Chiniquy's "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome," and "Forty Years in the Church of Christ," the same author's "The Priest, the Women and the Confessional"; Dr. Fulton's "How to Win Romanists," "Why Priests Should Wed," "Babylon," etc., and I also became a subscriber to that great anti-Catholic journal, THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, founded by an ex-priest, and at present edited by a former Roman Catholic priest, but now a Protestant bishop. After such instruction for over a year, I was convinced that the Protestant religion is the only Church of Jesus Christ, and that the Romanist faith is pagan and its practices grossly idolatrous. All of their articles of faith are not founded upon biblical teaching; not one of them. Their adoration of the wafer (which Romanists believe to be God) is rank idolatry, and it is now incomprehensible to me how our Protes-

stants can do other than look upon all Catholics as pagans. They all worship the virgin, and saints, and statues, crucifixes and what not, all of these material things, but not God, that is, the Protestant God. It becomes our duty, as Protestants, to do our utmost to *down* such a religious belief. But to do so we must ever be on the alert, for the Romanists and their priests are tricky and deceitful, but, thank God, we have such patriots and good men and women who devote their entire time exposing the errors of that anti-Christian religion to the people. These good souls, together with such great papers as "The Menace," "The American Citizen," etc., are enlightening the people as to the nature and dangers of Romanism in this Protestant country. Let the good work go on, and may God bless all who assist in this great work. Such papers as I have just referred to ought to be in the homes of every Protestant in this great country. Rome is losing ground every day, but the good work must never be neglected for a moment, else Rome will rapidly regain that which it hitherto had lost. Those who leave that Church to join the various branches of the great Protestant religion, will never return to her; they now know too much for that to ever take place. My prayer is that others of my former belief will likewise have their eyes opened ere it is too late.

J. S. WINNER.

---

"I frankly confess that the Catholics stand before the country as the enemies of the public schools."—Father Phelan.

---

#### FORM OF BEQUEST

*I give, devise and bequeath to Christ's Mission, New York, a corporation organized and existing under and pursuant to the Religious Corporations Law of the State of New York, and now located at No. 331 West 57th Street, in the city, county and State of New York*

(Specify Here the Property)

*to be applied to the uses and purposes of the said Mission, in such manner as the Board of Trustees thereof shall, in their discretion, determine.*